

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/779,076	02/07/2001	James M. Rochelle	26053.00	7830
22465 75	11/05/2003		EXAMINER	
PITTS AND BRITTIAN P C P O BOX 51295			WIMER, M	CHAEL C
KNOXVILLE, TN 37950-1295			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2821	

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<b>N</b> -				
B - 1		Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/779,076	ROCHELLE ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Michael C. Wimer	2821				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ib(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.						
2a) <u></u> □	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 C.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims	=x parte &aayle, 1000 0.D. 11, 4					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>4-13,16-23 and 28-30</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4-13,16-23 and 28-30</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
	ion Papers						
<u> </u>	The specification is objected to by the Examiner		minna				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) he hold in abovenes. See 37 CER 1.95(s)							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
Attachmen	-						
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2821

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Response to Amendment

1. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 29 September 2003 is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-28 based upon Stewart et al.

The arguments in the remarks is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of the previous Office action is withdrawn. Newly discovered reference to Avenel et al. (6407677 B1) is cited in this Office action. Rejections based on the newly cited reference follow.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 4-13,16-23 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al (6392547) in view of Avenel et al. (6407677).

  Regarding Claims 4-13,16-23 and 28-30, Stewart et al show a proximity monitoring system capable of accurate boundary detection independent of orientation comprising: a transmitter 21 including an antenna array 32,33 that continuously generates a magnetic field based on the transmitted electrical signal and having an intensity within the area 23 and defining a boundary 24, a receiver module 25 including an antenna array 53-55 responsive to the magnetic field, in any direction, and connected to a single channel receiver 56 and a measurement circuit for determining a total power of the magnetic field incident at the antenna array.

Application/Control Number: 09/779,076

Art Unit: 2821

Stewart et al do not teach three coils perpendicular to each other in the transmit circuit, but rather shows only two, 32 and 33. Thus, Avenel et al are cited as resolving the level of ordinary skill in the antenna art and teach the use of three perpendicular coils 1,2, and 3 having and disposed along respective axes. Avenel et al teach that the emitter (i.e., transmitter) may employ these three loop coils. Thus, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to employ such and antenna arrangement in lieu of the two axes/loop coils 32,33 of Stewart et al in order to provide an omnidirectional antenna radiation pattern.

Also, Stewart et al do not specifically call the processor 61 a "measurement circuit", but in column 5, lines 30-53 suggest to the skilled artisan that the processor performs a number of different functions. It would have been obvious to the skilled artisan that the processor must determine the total power or signal strength at the antennas 53-55. The three antennas are oriented in three distinct and different axes, and thus the total power is connected to a common node connected to the detector 56 connected to the demodulator 60 and connected to the processor 61. Stewart et al discuss the intensity threshold indicative that the receiver tag 25 is proximate the base station 21 within the perimeter 24. One skilled in the art recognizes as obvious that there is a measurement circuit implied in the circuitry since there is a preset threshold power level employed in the system. A skilled artisan would find it obvious that the threshold power level is achieved by measurement of the total power incident at the antenna array. The acknowledgement detection function (col. 5, lines 51-54) cannot be performed without the total power incident on the antenna array being measured.

Application/Control Number: 09/779,076

Art Unit: 2821

. 3

In a typical voting antenna system, power or signal strength at each antenna is measured and selected. Total power of the antennas is measured relative to other antenna elements and thus the proper antenna is employed in the respective plane. Regarding Claims 4-6,12-14, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to employ three transmitting antennas and/or two receiver antennas, and notice of such use is hereby taken. As to Claims 7 and 28, the line frequency multiple defining the carrier frequency is an obvious method used in transmitters. As to Claims 8,15-23, the oscillator and PLL and amplifiers, etc., are all obvious transmitter components in the Stewart et al system, and would therefore be obvious to employ therein, by the skilled artisan. As to Claims 9-11, the particular modulation technique is also obvious to the skilled artisan.

### Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims of record have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, comments to the measurement circuit for measuring total magnetic field power appears proper. The Stewart et al. system appears to provide such a circuit because the current produced by each coil is employed in the system. Its total power, collectively, must be measured in terms of voltage at each coil and processed by the processor. Collectively, the total power is employed in the processing aspect of the system. The claims do not point out that the measurement circuit in the receiver corresponds to that in, and corresponds to the transmit circuit/antenna arrangement as set forth on page 35, lines 1-13 of the specification.

. **.** . . .

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Wimer whose telephone number is (703) 305-3555. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don K. Wong can be reached on (703) 308-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Michael C. Wimer Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2821

MCW 15 October 2003